

German Patent and Trademark Office

Munich, 9th July 2001

Ser No: 100 39 363.2-43
Your Ref: 00/36122-I/V
No of Applicant: 1003704
Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft zur
Förderung der angewandten
Forschung eV

German Patent and Trademark Office . 80297 Munich

Patentanwälte
Pfenning, Meinig & Partner GbR
Mozartstr. 17

80336 München

Payment for request for examination was made on 11th August 2000

Response of

received on

The further examination of the above-identified Patent Application has had
the following result.

For a reply, a term of

four months

is granted, starting with delivery of this Action.

In this Action, the following References are cited for the first time (the consecutive
numbers of which also apply to the future proceedings):

- (1) German Printed Publication 41 19 303 A1
- (2) European Printed Publication 0 949 293 A2
- (3) US Printed Publication 5,779,909 A
- (4) Japanese Printed Publication 07173324 A (as WPIX Abstract)
- (5) Japanese Printed Publication 11255951 A (as WPIX Abstract)
- (6) US Printed Publication 5,232,954 A
- (7) German Printed Publication 195 44 172 A1

Grant of a patent on the present Subject-Matter of Application cannot be envisaged.

Processes for separating and recovering target polymers and their additives from a polymer-containing material by means of solvents and precipitants in accordance with Claim 1 belong to the basic repertoire of a polymer chemist and, accordingly, could be drawn from the State-Of-The-Art many times already prior to the Date of Application in the present case (cf., only by way of example, (1), Claim 1 in conjunction with the Description, Col 5, L 10 to 16 and 31 to 38; (2), Claims 2 and 4; (3), Claims 1 and 2; (4) and (5); (6), the Description, Col 3, L 45 to 50 and Col 4, L 26 to 28 and 55 to 62).

This being so, the Process as claimed in present Claim 1 does not show the novelty required for patent grant. For this reason, Main Claim 1 cannot be allowed.

Subclaims 2 to 24 cannot be allowed either – now that, on the one hand, the Subject-Matter of Main Claim 1 is not patentable and said subclaims, on the other hand, do not include any features patentable by themselves; the Features claimed therein either have likewise become known already from the State-Of-The-Art cited above or merely constitute mechanical measures, realisation of same not necessitating any inventive activity on the part of the expert who is entrusted with the Task. For the same reasons, independent Claims 25 to 27 cannot be allowed.

On the basis of the Documents on file now, grant of a patent cannot be envisaged; rather, rejection of the Application must be reckoned with.

If Applicant does not intend to relevantly reply to this Action, filing of an informal notice on receipt of same is asked for.

Examiner in charge of Class C 08 J

(Signature)

Maurus, Dr

(Inter-ofc tel no: 4349)

Enclosure:

7 photocopied references (in triplicate)